

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed June 13, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 53, 60, 67, 74, 81 and 88 have been amended to further particularly point out and distinctly claim subject matter regarded as the invention. Support for these changes may be found in the specification, page 16, lines 14-18. The text of claims 54-59, 61-66, 68-73, 75-80, 82-87 and 89-94 is unchanged, but their meaning is changed because they depend from amended claims.

With this amendment it is respectfully submitted the claims satisfy the statutory requirements.

Interview Summary

On August 15, 2005, a telephonic interview was conducted between Examiner Patel and Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626. The Examiner is thanked for granting this interview. During this interview, the amendment contained in the current response was discussed. The Examiner indicated that such an amendment would overcome the current rejections, and indicated a new search might be conducted, but if no new prior art was found, the claims would be allowed. The Examiner requested that the amendment be formally filed, and Applicant submits the current response to fulfill that request.

The 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 53-57, 60-64, 67-71, 74-78, 81-85 and 88-92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Beser¹, among which claims 53, 60, 67, 74, 81 and 88 are independent claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

According to the M.P.E.P., a claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.²

Beser fails to teach or suggest "modifying a value a server identifier field in said response to match said proxy address" as claimed in claim 53 as amended. In Beser, there is no modification of the server identifier field once it is sent from the address allocation device. As stated in column 15, lines 22-23, the SIADDR field contains "IP 54 address of next server to use in bootstrap; returned in DHCPOFFER, DHCPACK and DHCPNAK by server." Thus, there is clearly no modification of the field in the response once the response is issued by the address allocation device (server). The presently claimed invention indicates first that the response is received from an address allocation device, then that a value in the server identifier field is modified in that response to match the proxy address. As such, Applicant respectfully maintains that claim 53 is in condition for allowance.

¹ U.S. Patent No. 6,189,102

² Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2131. See also *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

As to independent claims 60, 67, 74, 81, and 88, these claims contain element(s) similar to that as described above with respect to claim 53, and thus Applicant respectfully maintains that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

As to dependent claims 54-57, 61-64, 68-71, 75-78, 82-85 and 89-92, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

The First 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 58, 65, 72, 79, 86 and 93 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Beser. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to dependent claims 58, 65, 72, 79, 86 and 93, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

The Second 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 59, 66, 73, 80, 87 and 94 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Beser in view of Michael³. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to dependent claims 59, 66, 73, 80, 87 and 94, the argument set forth above is equally applicable here. The base claims being allowable, the dependent claims must also be allowable.

³ Michael Patrick, "DHCP Relay Agent Information Option", *Motorola ISG*, July 30, 1997

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that the claims are now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

It is believed that this Amendment places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

THELEN REID & PRIEST, LLP

Dated: 8/15/05



Marc S. Hanish
Reg. No. 42,626

Thelen Reid & Priest LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040